

REMARKS

The Office Action of February 5, 2007 has been received and carefully reviewed. The preceding amendments and the following remarks form a full and complete response thereto. Claims 1-10, 12-23 and 25-27 are amended. Claims 11 and 24 are cancelled. New claims 28 and 29 are presented. No new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-10, 12-23 and 25-29 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are requested.

Amendments to the Specification

The specification is amended to remove reference to a cancelled claim. The specification is also amended (paragraph [0071]) to correct a grammar and a transcription error: “2.0B” is two point zero ‘B’.

New claims

Claim 28 and 29 are new. No new matter is added. Claim 28 finds support in, for example, paragraph [0040] (paragraph references are to those numbered paragraphs of the published application, U.S. Pat. Publication No. 2004/0145534). Claim 29 finds support in, for example, paragraph [0040].

Amendments to claims

Amendments to claim 1 find support in, for example, original claims 11, 24, and 28. Claim 1 is also amended, as are claims 2-10, 11-23, and 25-27, as to form.

Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8, 10-20, 24, 25, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,705,747 to Bailey. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Bailey fails to disclose each and every element of these claims as amended. For example, Bailey fails to disclose “a display unit having a graphics resolution of at least 320×240 pixels” as recited in amended claim 1. The Office Action erroneously contended that Bailey discloses a (VGA) display unit having 320×240 pixels (in regard to claim 10). This contention is unsupported by Bailey and fails to meet the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2) that the particular part of a reference relied on by the Office to reject a claim “must be designated as

nearly as practicable.” In contrast to the contention, Bailey actually discloses multiple discrete display components such as seven-segment light-emitting diode displays (see, e.g., col. 4, ll. 8-10, 41-42; col. 7, l. 59-col. 8, l. 12) and light-emitting diode matrices (col. 7, ll. 53-56). Bailey discloses that the light-emitting diode matrices designated LEDMTX are part description LTP-1257AA (table I). Parts with this designation are apparently associated with the manufacturer Lite-On and are disclosed in a datasheet to be LED matrices of 5×7 elements (see, e.g., LTP-1257AA-01 datasheet, available at <http://optodatabook.liteon.com/DataBookFiles/11607/P1257AA-01.pdf>, last viewed August 2, 2007). Thus, Bailey fails to disclose a display unit having a graphics resolution of at least 320×240 pixels as recited in claim 1. Therefore claim 1 and dependent claims 2-5, 8, 10, 12-20, 25, and 27 are allowable over Bailey for at least this reason. (Applicants also note that Bailey does not disclose a VGA display unit and therefore claim 10 and dependent claims 15 and 16 are allowable over Bailey for this additional independent reason.)

Also, Bailey fails to disclose “a data bus for communications between the control unit and the liquid system wherein the data bus is compatible with Controller Area Network (CAN) or RS485” as recited in amended claim 1. The Office Action erroneously contended (with respect to now cancelled claim 24) that Bailey discloses this feature in Fig. 3. However, this contention is unsupported by Fig. 3 as no data bus is shown. Fig. 3 merely purports to illustrate that the display is connected with “examples of alternative sensing devices” (col. 2, l. 60); Fig. 3 fails to disclose any detail regarding the manner of connection. Bailey nowhere discloses a data bus, much less a data bus compatible with CAN or RS485. Therefore claim 1 and dependent claims 2-5, 8, 10, 12-20, 25, and 27 are allowable over Bailey for at least this additional independent reason. Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-5, 8, 10, 12-20, 25, and 27 be withdrawn.

Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 7, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Bailey. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Bailey fails to disclose each and every element of these claims as amended. Claims 6, 7, and 26 depend on allowable claim 1 either directly or through an intermediate claim. Thus claims 6, 7, and 26 are allowable

at least due to their dependency on allowable claim 1 and Applicants request that the rejection of claims 6, 7, and 28 be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 9, 21, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bailey in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,533,648 to Read et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the combination of Bailey and Read fails to disclose each and every element of these claims as amended. For example, neither reference teaches or suggests "a data bus for communications between the control unit and the liquid system wherein the data bus is compatible with Controller Area Network (CAN) or RS485" or "a display unit having a graphics resolution of at least 320×240 pixels" as recited in amended claim 1. Claims 9, 21, 22, and 23 on depend on allowable claim 1 either directly or through an intermediate claim. Thus claims 9, 21, 22, and 23 are allowable at least due to their dependency on claim 1 and Applicants request that the rejection of claims 9, 21, 22, and 23 be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims satisfy the requirements of the patent statutes and are patentable over the cited art. Reconsideration of the instant application and early notice of allowance are requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if it is deemed to expedite allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

Angle, 2007

By

Robert B. Murray

Robert B. Murray
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 22,980
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, p.c.
Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202)783-6040